

As disappointed as I am in this legislation as a whole, I am not in the least bit surprised. This legislation is the work of lobbyists—not statesmen.

Instead of a strategic vision of what will be required in order to convert Medicare into a wellness program and what will be required to assure that the large and growing number of Americans who work for small businesses will have the benefit of a pension and retirement fund—instead of those strategic visions—this is the work of special interest tunnel vision. Instead of balancing the interests of all Americans, this bill goes full tilt towards the luckiest few.

I suggest when legislation is drafted in the dark this is what we can expect. Behind those closed doors, the drafters seem to forget basic math. That basic math is that every dollar we spend—such as pumping excessive funds into HMOs—is \$1 that we take directly out of the surplus.

Every dollar spent on tax cuts is one that will not be spent on saving Social Security by paying down the national debt, and will not be spent on modernizing Medicare to make it a wellness program.

I have used words such as “squandering,” “flittering,” and “wasting” before this body more often in the last 2 weeks than I would have liked.

I have watched any chance that this body had to create a comprehensive strategic spending plan for our future die a small and painful death.

I am left with the hope that President Clinton will indeed veto this bill as promised, and that a few billion dollars can be spent paying down the national debt before the next Congress gets its hands on the purse strings again.

I am not surprised that we are at this point. But I must admit I am a bit puzzled.

Is it really possible that some of my colleagues don't realize that a slice here and a snack there will eventually leave nothing but crumbs? Can it be that they truly believe we can have our surplus and eat it too? Or are they feasting on the surplus behind closed doors fully aware that they are telling the system, starve for reform, that we will be fine, and go ahead, eat cake?

Thank you Mr. President.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post]

AD BLITZ ERODES DEMOCRATS' EDGE ON
PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

(By Juliet Eilperin and Thomas B. Edsall)

Buoyed by a massive advertising blitz from business groups, Republicans have managed to erode some of the Democrats' political advantage on the issue of prescription drugs for seniors, according to polling data and independent analysts.

Republicans have had some success neutralizing an issue the Democrats had hoped to ride to victory in both the presidential race and many congressional contests across the country, the analysts said. In fact, in a few key races, Republicans have successfully used the issue to skewer the Democrats as big government spenders.

Fueling the Republicans have been tens of millions of dollars in ads from the pharmaceutical industry, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and other business groups lauding the GOP's private-sector-oriented approach to providing drug coverage for seniors. Republican ads for Texas Gov. George W. Bush and other candidates have also portrayed Democratic proposals to add a drug benefit to the Medicare program as a potential bureaucratic nightmare.

Democrats “just assumed we would roll over and say, ‘You know, we are against seniors and for the big drug companies, so come on over and take the House and Senate back with it,’” said GOP pollster Glen Bolger. “But Republicans decided not to do what the Democrats wanted.”

Just three months ago, Bush had no plan to provide prescription drug coverage for seniors and was badly trailing Vice President Gore on the issue. A Washington Post/Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation/Harvard University poll in July showed Gore with a strong advantage over Bush, 49 percent to 38 percent, when voters were asked which candidate would do a better job “helping people 65 and over to pay for prescription medicines.”

Three months later, after an onslaught of Republican National Committee advertising on the drug issue, the Gore advantage had disappeared. When voters were asked whom they trusted to handle “Medicare and prescription drug coverage,” they were evenly split, 45 percent saying Gore and 43 percent Bush.

Democratic operatives acknowledge that Republicans have had some success muddying the waters on prescription drugs. In mid-September, the party's own internal surveys showed that Gore's advantage on the issue has slipped to single digits, one top pollster said.

But a fall advertising campaign has helped put the issue back into the Democratic column, this pollster said, and Gore and his party now hold a 15-point advantage on the question of who would better address the prescription drug problem.

Robert Blendon, a health policy specialist involved in the Post/Kaiser/Harvard poll, said surveys suggest the public, in fact, prefers Gore's proposal to add a prescription drug benefit to Medicare over Bush's plan to encourage insurance companies to provide the coverage.

But he added that most voters “don't exactly understand the nuances between the two policies,” making it difficult for Gore to gain an advantage.

On the congressional level, Republicans have tried to defuse the issue by approving a measure allowing the reimportation of cheaper prescription drugs and, in the case of the House, passing their own drug coverage bill along the lines of what Bush is proposing.

And when Republican candidates have had the money to spend, they have been able to tarnish their opponents: Sen. Spencer Abraham (Mich.) saw his numbers surge this summer after he ran a series of unanswered attacks against the drug proposal of Rep. Deborah Ann Stabenow (D-Mich.); and both Sen. Conrad Burns (Mont.) and Senate hopeful John Ensign of Nevada improved their standing in the polls after launching similar ads.

But according to Michigan-based pollster Ed Sarpolus, older voters who became confused on the drug issue are now beginning to gravitate back to Gore and Stabenow.

“It's human nature. If you're confused, you vote for what you know,” said Sarpolus, who added that voters tend to trust Democrats more on health care.

Individual House Republicans, bolstered by their party committees and business groups,

have also aggressively defended their records on drug coverage in recent months. Rep. Heather A. Wilson (R-N.M.) saw her poll numbers rise significantly among seniors once she began running ads on the GOP plan. Ohio Republican Pat Tiberi—who is hoping to succeed his former boss, Rep. John R. Kasich—also expanded his lead in the polls after the National Republican Congressional Committee funded ads attacking his opponent's position on prescription drugs.

Former representative Scotty Baesler (D-Ky.), who is hoping to defeat freshman Rep. Ernie Fletcher (R-Ky.), said the Republicans “muddled the waters very well” on the question of prescription drugs, prompting him to air ads on gun control instead because “it's a definite separation between myself and Fletcher.”

Rep. E. Clay Shaw Jr. (R-Fla.) has even turned the issue into a liability for his opponent Elaine Bloom, blanketing his district with ads highlighting how she served on the board of directors of a company that makes generic drugs and that received payments from a competitor in exchange for keeping a heart medicine off the market.

The party committees are not the only groups touting the GOP's drug plan in recent weeks. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has run several commercials decrying the Democrats' proposal as a potential bureaucratic nightmare while Citizens for Better Medicare—a group funded by the pharmaceutical industry—has spent \$50 million on an ad campaign supporting the position taken by House and Senate Republicans.

Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee Chairman Patrick J. Kennedy (R-I.) said, “The \$50 million in independent expenditures from the major pharmaceutical companies has validated the Republicans' belief that money can buy anything including their inaction on a real prescription drug benefit for Medicare.”

Republican pollster Bill McInturff said that in the battleground states where GOP advertising on prescription drugs has been concentrated, “these are roughly parallel numbers” concerning which party and which candidate has the advantage. “This is clearly a case where advertising has affected people's opinions,” he said.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak in morning business. I apologize for the lateness of the hour.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

NO DEFINED ENERGY POLICY

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, it is late. We have had pretty candid discussions on various issues before us. It is a political season. There is a lot of finger pointing, whether we talk about Social Security, Medicare, or the benefits of care associated with drug plans. I think we all share a common commitment to try to have meaningful legislation come out of the process. We simply have different points of view.

You heard the Senator from Florida comment extensively on the Republican plan to strengthen Medicare. I am not here to comment on the Republican plan on Medicare, although I think it is quite defensible. But I am here to talk about the Democratic plan for an energy policy.

You will notice, unlike the Senator from Florida, that I don't have a chart to show you what the Democratic energy plan is for the simple reason that there isn't any. This administration has absolutely no energy plan as evidenced by the dilemma that we face in this country as we watch our imports from the Mideast climb to approximately 58 percent. Fifty-eight percent of the oil that we consume in this country is imported.

We have seen a dramatic increase in the price of gasoline. Gasoline is in the area of \$1.75 cents to \$1.80, depending on the grade.

We have seen heating oil in the country raised to approximately \$1.56. Here in Washington alone, it has increased 56 cents a gallon in less than 10 months.

We have seen natural gas on which 50 percent of the homes in this country are dependent increase from \$2.16 for 1,000 cubic feet to deliveries in November at \$5.40 per 1,000 cubic feet.

We have a situation with our refining industry in which we haven't built a new refinery in this country in decades. We have shut down 30-some refineries. We find ourselves at loggerheads because of our inability to refine, if you will, enough of the blends to address the Northeast heating oil shortage.

It is fair to say that we don't have a defined energy policy. We have an energy policy that seems to be driven by environmental groups that do not accept the responsibility for realism.

Realism dictates that we are not going to move out of here tomorrow or the next day on hot air. We are going to move out on kerosene. Kerosene comes from oil. Kerosene is what you put in the jet airplane. I don't attempt to be oversimplistic, but what we continue to need in this country is a balance of all the energy resources.

The Middle East last week gave us another reminder as to our crisis. That is the fear that we are going to be held hostage to foreign oil imports. I have been coming to this floor for many days now warning of how our dependence on foreign oil threatens the national security of this Nation. I certainly don't take any pride at this late hour in coming here and saying I told you so. We know the Middle East is a tinderbox. Some of our most impassioned enemies are already lighting fires there.

What little energy policy this administration has in the sense of increasing reliance on foreign oil has come in conflict, in my opinion, with our foreign policy. How can we pretend to play the role of an ally to Israel or even an honest broker when we are now beholden to Israel's sworn enemy, Saddam Hussein, of Iraq?

Now we are looking to Saddam Hussein to keep our citizens from freezing this winter. We are importing about 750,000 barrels of oil a day from Saddam Hussein. Many people forget we fought a war over there in 1991 and 1992. We lost 147 American lives.

Today, the real wild card is in Iraq and the Middle East. I mentioned my previous concern over Saddam Hussein and the leverage he brings, but some analysts estimate that oil will increase to \$40 to \$45 a barrel if Iraq halts oil sales or reduces oil sales. The significance of that is the position that Saddam Hussein and Iraq currently hold.

Iraq, we know, has threatened to stop oil exports if the U.N. doesn't convert Iraqi dollars held by the U.N. to Euro dollars for trading. We know Iraqi exports have dropped a little bit, by about 500,000 barrels a day just last week. It is not clear whether this is the start of an ominous trend. Even if supply disruptions do not occur, world oil markets are stretched so thin that even the possibility of a disruption could raise prices even more. And it did so last week.

Currently, I think oil closed today around \$34 a barrel. We have seen a high on two occasions of \$37 within the last month or so. But the reality is that Saddam Hussein controls about almost 2.8 million barrels a day of daily exports, and that is more than the available excess capacity worldwide.

What I am saying is that the difference between the world's ability to produce oil and the world's consumption is a little over a million barrels—there is a little over a million-barrel capacity—but Saddam Hussein controls 2.8 million. My point is if Saddam Hussein reduces his sales, then we are in an even tighter position and as a consequence we can expect the price to go up. And Saddam Hussein is aware of this.

There is no question about his actions of late. He has become more aggressive in recent months. It is rather interesting to note, after every speech, he concludes it with "Death to Israel." If there is ever a threat to Israel's security, it comes from Iraq. He has a \$14,000 bounty on each American plane shot down. Thank God there haven't been any. But we have flown over 200,000 individual flights over Iraq, enforcing the no-fly zone, an area of blockade since the 1990s.

Last month, Saddam Hussein accused Kuwait of stealing Iraqi oil. Here we go again. He did this shortly before invading Kuwait in 1990.

Last week, nearly 15,000 Iraqi Republican Guard troops moved westward in a show of force, obviously toward Israel. Just yesterday, Saddam Hussein said: Jihad, holy war, is the only way to liberate Palestine.

How quickly we forget. Let me remind everyone, before President Clinton and Vice President GORE took office, we carried out Desert Storm and 147 Americans were killed, 467 were wounded, and 23 were taken prisoner. We continue to enforce the no-fly zone. The cost to the taxpayers is about \$50 million per month. It is still going on. Yet the administration seems to want to rely more on Iraqi oil.

We have had in this country a 17-percent decline in domestic production,

yet the demand has increased 14 percent. In August of last year, we consumed more oil in this country than ever before. What is the rationale?

We are traveling more. The economy is growing. We are an electronic society. We need more energy. Where does it come from? It doesn't come from thin air. Now 58 percent of our oil comes from overseas. Some people perhaps remember 1973 when we had the Arab oil embargo. We had lines around the block. People were indignant. They were mad. They were outraged. We couldn't get gasoline at the gas station. At that time, we were 36-percent dependent on imported oil and we created the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

Here we are today with Iraq, the fastest growing source of U.S. foreign oil, 750,000 barrels a day, nearly 50 percent of all Iraqi exports. I don't want to be oversimplistic, but we buy Saddam Hussein's oil, put it in our airplanes, and go over and bomb him. Is that a sensible, responsible foreign policy?

In a few words, that is what is happening. You can interpret it however you desire. This administration's inattention to maintaining the U.N. conditions against Iraq has left the sanctions in a shambles. We aren't doing any weapons inspections in Iraq; increased Iraqi flights across Saudi airspace in the no-fly zone continue; his development of missile, missile delivery systems, and biological warfare capabilities continues. Russia and France have openly challenged our sanctions. Turkey sends flights to Baghdad despite the U.N. ban.

It is simply not working. Our friends in Jordan are demanding the end to inspections of Iraqi imports through Jordanian ports. Saddam Hussein is about to get a free pass to import anything he wishes despite the U.N. sanctions. Does anyone doubt he will be able to import what he needs to continue his weapons of mass destruction? We are going to have to deal with this one of these days.

Let me say again what little energy policy we seem to have is a reliance on imported oil, and it has certainly come into conflict with our foreign policy, with potentially disastrous consequences for American consumers and our national security.

I am pleased to say that George W. Bush, and our Vice President nominee, Mr. Cheney, have spoken about how to decrease our dependence on imported oil by developing some of the reserves that we have here at home, open up the overthrust belt—Wyoming, Colorado, Utah—areas where we have great potential, areas where the administration has closed up to 64 percent of the public land, exempting that area from development, and my State of Alaska, where the administration refuses to allow an opening of the area which might have the largest reserves known to exist in North America, that small sliver of ANWR.

There are a lot of misunderstandings about the area of Alaska known as

ANWR. It is 19 million acres, the size of the State of South Carolina. Congress, wisely, has taken out of that 19 million acres, 8.5 million acres and put it in permanent wilderness. They have taken another 9 million acres and put it into a refuge, leaving 1.5 million acres for a decision to be made whether to open it. The geologists tell us there might be as much as 16 billion barrels of oil there. That would equal what we import from Saudi Arabia for a 30-year period. It is a very significant amount.

Some people say that is a 200-day supply. That is totally unrealistic because that assumes there would be no other oil produced anywhere in the world. Obviously the Russians, the Venezuelans, and the others would produce.

So as we look at potential energy sources here at home, I think we have to look to the advanced technology that we have been able to develop in this country and the record of opening up areas in the Arctic such as Prudhoe Bay, where we find a contribution of nearly 20 percent of the total crude oil produced in this country. That has come about over a period of 23 years. The significance of that speaks for itself.

You might not like oil fields, but Prudhoe Bay is the best in the world. We could have the same potential by opening up that small sliver of the Arctic known as the 1002 area.

The interesting thing is that industry tells us, out of 1.5 million acres, we would probably utilize as little as 2,000 acres—not much bigger than a medium-sized farm—to open up the area.

I was rather interested in looking at the Christian Science Monitor the other day. They did a poll across America on what the attitude would be of opening ANWR. The poll was 58 to 34 in favor. That is a rather startling result, and I think it surprised some of the folks at the newspaper as well.

The point is, charity does begin at home. There are those on the other side who simply blame big oil. I remind them, where was big oil when they were handing out oil a year ago at \$10 a barrel? Big oil in this country—Exxon, British Petroleum, Chevron, Texaco—does not set the price of oil. Do you know why? Because we are so dependent on imports. Saudi Arabia, OPEC, Mexico, Venezuela—they are the suppliers. They are supplying us with 58 percent. They set the price. We are addicted; we pay it; and that is the consequence of becoming so dependent when, indeed, we have the technology in this country to open up some of these frontiers safely.

We have, in the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, an unused capacity of a million barrels a day. As a consequence, the development of that portion of ANWR could be done very easily, and it could be done very quickly. If we had the conviction of our commitments to simply make a statement that that is our intention, there is no question in the mind of this Senator we would see oil

drop \$10 a barrel. We saw the President's action the other day when he pulled 30 million barrels out of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. The price dropped from \$37 a barrel to somewhere in the area of \$32 a barrel.

Let me conclude with a little evaluation of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and the actions, or should I say the "mis-actions" of the administration handling them.

As we know, when the Vice President made a recommendation to the President that we sell 30 million barrels from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, the price was nearly \$37 a barrel, prices which last month prompted the administration, of course, to release this oil from SPR. Now word comes from the Department of Energy that initially only 7 million barrels of that original 30 million barrels would have to go up for rebid. It is kind of interesting because they waived the normal bid requirements. They didn't require normal financial responsibility. They said they would do that later. Three of the bidders could not meet the demands, and as a consequence they had to bid it again. But they recognized their mistake the next time because they did require the bidders meet financial capability for performance.

In any event, according to the Department of Energy's own analysis, 20 million of the 30 million barrels will simply displace foreign oil imports. The reason for that is our refineries are running at 96-percent capacity. They cannot, basically, take any more oil. They can only get so much out through this process because we have not built new refineries in 10 years. We have simply increased some of our larger refineries. We have also lost about 37 refineries in the last decade. It is not a very attractive business to be in.

In any event, the Department of Energy has decided that out of the 30 million barrels, there are probably going to be only 10 million barrels that are going to be refined into finished product. Currently, U.S. refinery yields are about 8 percent heating oil and 92 percent other products, whether it be gasoline, diesel, kerosene, and so forth. So if we do the math, while the Department of Energy suggests 3 million to 5 million barrels of heating oil will result from the SPR release, we find that the testimony from those representing the Department of Energy uses the terminology "distillates."

What are distillates? They would lead you to believe this was heating oil and would benefit the Northeast, but it is not. We found out that current refinery yields of 10 million barrels of SPR oil will yield only 800,000 barrels of heating oil. That is less than a 1-day supply.

When you look at the intent of the administration's effort to open up the SPR, it was to increase the heating oil supply availability in the Northeast, a portion of the country that does not have the availability of natural gas. Their objective was not achieved. They

have less than a 1-day supply out of this sale. How ironic.

What they did is they did manipulate the price because the price did drop, but the supply did not increase. If the administration's intent was to get more heating oil to the market, that certainly was not the way to do it. They could have explored thoroughly the offer by the Venezuelan state oil company to produce heating oil for direct delivery to the United States or they could have made a greater effort to convince companies to voluntarily reduce exports, refine product until stocks were at a more comfortable level.

Again, I refer you to the objective. The objective was not met. Manipulation of the price was. But I do not think this was the real reason for the SPR release. As I have indicated, the real reason was to manipulate the price. They had some success. Prices did dip down to \$31 a barrel. But we have seen that erased, with prices back up to \$34 a barrel.

Heating oil stocks in the Northeast have actually declined. They have declined 600,000 barrels since the administration came up with the idea of releasing the SPR crude oil, which has to be refined and, incidentally, is not going to be made available until November.

One of the more interesting things they left out of the sale was no prohibition against exporting the SPR oil, so many of the profiteers in oil simply bid the oil in with the idea of exporting it. There was no ban on exports and there was no ban on heating oil. The market in Europe is higher than the U.S. Some traders will simply refine that crude oil, turn it into heating oil, and export it to Europe because they had no prohibition in their bid.

The administration's logic was flawed when it announced this, and it seems to have only gotten worse. The bottom line is, rather than increase domestic production of oil and gas to ensure our energy security, again the administration falls back to its reliance on foreign oil imports, posing significant threat to our national security, undermining our foreign policy in the Mideast, and the administration's strategy is also to try to manipulate prices when necessary by releasing oil from SPR.

We need a real energy policy, such as that proposed by one of the candidates for President, Governor Bush; one that ensures a clean, affordable, secure energy supply for American consumers, one that increases domestic production of oil and gas. Why should we be exploring in the rain forests of Colombia where there are no environmental considerations? Instead, we should be using our technology to develop the frontier areas in the overthrust belt in my State of Alaska. We need to expand the use of alternative fuels and renewable energy, which is part of the Bush-Cheney plan, and we need improved energy efficiency for all kinds of energy uses. I am pleased to say that is a position Governor Bush supports as well.

The emphasis of this administration has been on natural gas. The only problem is there has been a tremendous increase in the price of natural gas. Natural gas was \$2.16, as I said, 10 months ago. It is \$5.40 per delivery per thousand cubic feet. The emphasis, particularly from our utility industry, is that they have nowhere to turn for a source of energy other than natural gas. There has not been a new coal-fired plant built in this country since the mid-1990s. We have no new hydrodams. In fact, the administration is supporting taking out hydrodams in the West. There has been a collapse of our nuclear program. We cannot address the nuclear waste issue. We have not built a new reactor in 15 to 20 years and none are on the horizon.

As a consequence, we need to go back to our energy policy and bring a balance. Bring in nuclear. Obviously, it contributes to the quality of our air. Look at hydro, which we can safely develop. Look at clean coal. We have the technology to do it. We can recognize that 50 percent of the homes dependent on natural gas are going to be subject to some substantial price increases if we do not develop more energy at home. As a consequence, what we need here is a balanced energy policy. The administration's energy policy is that there simply is not any.

NORTH KOREA

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, with the President contemplating a visit to North Korea, I think it is fair to question the logic of that kind of a decision at this time. This historic meeting, if it does take place between the two leaders, could have significant implications for North and South Korea. I will explain a little bit more.

The leader of North Korea has hinted at plans to cease missile testing. He has indicated a proposed halt to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and North Korea's hermit-like isolation. I have had the opportunity to visit North Korea. I was one of the first Members of this body about 5 years ago to fly in an Air Force plane to North Korea, the first Air Force plane to fly there since 1943. It was an extraordinary lesson in a country that is probably as backward as any nation on Earth.

In any event, it is fair to say our Secretary of State, in completing a series of historic meetings with the North Korean leaders in Pyongyang, has set the stage pretty much for a Presidential visit.

The concern I have associated with the development of a rapport between North and South Korea, I wonder just what the benefit of a U.S. intervention could be at this time. Still, while improving relations certainly is a cause for optimism, I do not think it is really time to celebrate.

North Korea has a horrendous record. For over 50 years, it has been a living embodiment, if you will, of George Or-

well's nightmarish visions. The original Big Brother, Kim Il-Song, has been replaced by his son. A legacy of terror and aggression pervades in that country. Recent efforts to recast North Korea's leader Kim Chong-il as a likable fellow strikes me as little out of character. Here is a man whose regime has for years been at the top of America's terrorist watch list. There is no question he assassinated South Korean officials in Burma several years ago. They fired missiles across Japanese territory not long ago and actively sought to develop nuclear capability. It has been a regime whose policy has resulted in mass starvation of its people, that diverts food and resources of the neediest to feed and house the few who live in splendor, and develop, obviously, their weapons capability.

This is a man who utters an offhand remark suggesting that North Korea could be convinced to halt its missile program, and the administration seems to hail him as showing "a willingness to undertake reform." I guess I am not quite ready to buy that yet. I think that is a naive approach. I am a little more skeptical.

At every turn, North Korea's concessions have turned out to be false promises made strictly to blackmail U.S. and South Korea into giving direct economic assistance to the bankrupt North.

I wonder why we are so eager to believe that North Korea's apparent concessions now are anything other than a pretext.

Like my colleagues, I certainly applaud South Korea's President Kim Dae-jung's sunshine diplomacy efforts to reduce North-South tensions. His efforts have been admirable. I think the Koreans should be taking the lead themselves in rebuilding the trust between the two nations. Only through that direct effort by the two sides, free of outside interference, can tensions truly be resolved.

As a consequence, I worry that the administration's bull-in-the-China-shop-like interjection of itself into the dialog threatens to dictate, perhaps overwhelm, the delicate process of trust building.

Already we have seen North Korea delay fulfillment of its commitments to South Korea because it "was too busy" preparing for Secretary Albright's visit. This suggests to me that the North might shift attention to relations with the U.S. and away from South Korea and have the effect of undermining attempts at a true accord between North and South.

I understand President Clinton is anxious for a foreign policy accomplishment in light of the difficulties in the Mideast. He certainly worked toward resolution. It is unfortunate that has not happened. In any event, the question of peaceful and secure relations with North Korea would be a valuable legacy, but I question the direct involvement in the process and whether or not that shifting away from the

South Korean dialog with the North to the intervention of the U.S. may be harmful at this time.

Not only would efforts to reach a speedy agreement with North Korea be premature, in my opinion, it would seem to reward the North for 50 years of aggression as thanks for 6 months of sunshine.

Both the prospects for peace and the President's legacy would be best served if he were to stay, I believe, on the sidelines and allow the U.S.-North Korean relations to proceed as they have been, with caution and balance. I urge the President to put diplomacy ahead of legacy and not spend the final days of his administration interposing the U.S. between the two Koreas.

CARA LEGISLATION

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD page 19 of the specific legislation authorizing the CARA legislation, which establishes a program affecting the Outer Continental Shelf revenue stream.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"(8) The term 'qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues' means all amounts received by the United States from each leased tract or portion of a leased tract lying seaward of the zone defined and governed by section 8(g) of this Act, or lying within such zone but to which section 8(g) does not apply, the geographic center of which lies within a distance of 200 miles from any part of the coastline of any Coastal State, including bonus bids, rents, royalties (including payments for royalties taken in kind and sold), net profit share payments, and related late payment interest. Such term does not include any revenues from a leased tract or portion of a leased tract that is included within any area of the Outer Continental Shelf where a moratorium on new leasing was in effect as of January 1, 2000, unless the lease was issued prior to the establishment of the moratorium and was in production on January 1, 2000.

* * * * *
11(a) The term "Secretary" means Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, the purpose of my reference is that I happen to be chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee which historically has had jurisdiction over Outer Continental Shelf activities. I was one of the major drafters of this legislation, along with Representative DON YOUNG in the House of Representatives.

In moving this legislation through yesterday morning, we found a significant change had been made in the legislation and that the jurisdiction had been moved from the Energy Committee to Commerce and taken from Interior and transferred over to the Secretary of Commerce.

I know this cannot be seen, but there are handwritten notations at the end that simply say: "11(a) the term 'Secretary' means Secretary of Commerce."